

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant :	Francis et al.	Art Unit :	2195
Serial No. :	10/754,443	Examiner :	Meng Yao Zhe
Filed :	January 8, 2004	Confirmation No.:	7986
		Notice of Allowance Date:	November 12, 2009
Title :	RESOLVING SCHEDULING CONFLICTS IN A RECORDING DEVICE		

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE

In response to the Notice of Allowance mailed November 12, 2009, enclosed is a completed issue fee transmittal form PTOL-85b.

The fee in the amount of \$755 for the required fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other credits or charges to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2010

/Brian J. Gustafson/

Brian J. Gustafson

Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 26181
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant	: Francis et al.	Art Unit	: 2195
Serial No.	: 10/754,443	Examiner	: Meng Yao Zhe
Filed	: January 8, 2004	Confirmation No.:	7986
Notice of Allowance Date: November 12, 2009			
Title	: RESOLVING SCHEDULING CONFLICTS IN A RECORDING DEVICE		

MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

The applicant recognizes that in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 1302.14, the examiner's reasons for allowance need not set forth all of the details as to why the claims are allowed.

The applicant does not concede that the examiner's stated reasons for allowance are the only reasons for which the claims are allowable. The claims may be allowable for other reasons as well. In particular, applicant does not concede that all of the limitations identified by the examiner are necessary to distinguish the prior art of record or to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. In addition, the examiner does not assert, and the applicant would not concede, that the examiner's reasons have any bearing on the patentability of claims in any other applications directed to the disclosed subject matter.

In addition, each dependent claim stands on its own and is allowable on its own merits. In particular, each dependent claim may be allowable on the basis of a combination of some of the features recited in the dependent claim and its base claim(s), which combination of features may not include all of the limitations identified in the examiner's reasons for allowance.

Please apply any charges or credits related to this paper to our Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 12, 2010

/Brian J. Gustafson/
Brian J. Gustafson
Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 26181
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945